

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated April 13, 2005. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-16 and 18-28 are pending in this application with claims 18-28 added, claims 1 and 9 amended and claim 17 canceled by the present Amendment. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (two different rejections). Claim 11 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter but was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-16 and 18-28 are presented for reconsideration.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huard et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0206050, "Huard"). Claim 17 has been canceled, rendering the rejection moot with regard to this claim. In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that this reference teaches each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants disagree and request reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huard in view of Clark et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,775, "Clark"). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huard in view of He et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,627, "He"). In making these rejections, the Office Action asserts that the combination of these references teaches and/or suggests the claimed invention.

The Office Action also asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art would combine these references. Applicants disagree and request reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

...wherein the supply voltage monitoring circuit outputs an internal reset signal when the level monitored by the supply voltage monitoring circuit becomes lower than a predetermined minimum level.

The Office Action, at page 4, second full paragraph, asserts that the supply monitoring circuit 64, shown in Figure 6 of Huard, outputs an internal reset signal (Vnow).

Huard, in Fig. 6 and the description thereof in paragraph [0023] teaches:

A temperature sensor 62 measures the operating temperature of the load circuit and provides a signal T indicating the present temperature. A voltage sensor 64 is coupled to measure the Vcc voltage provided to the load circuit, and to provide a present voltage signal Vnow indicating the instantaneous present voltage. In some embodiments, the temperature sensor and the voltage sensor may be constructed as one unified module performing both functions.

As illustrated above, Huard's voltage sensor 64 only provides a present voltage signal Vnow that indicates the instantaneous present voltage. However, the supply voltage monitoring circuit fails to output an internal reset signal when the level monitored by the supply voltage monitoring circuit becomes lower than a predetermined level.

Neither Clark nor He is cited for, or discloses, a supply voltage monitoring circuit that outputs an internal reset signal when the level monitored by the supply voltage monitoring circuit becomes lower than a predetermined minimum level.

Consequently, Huard alone, or in combination with either Clark or He, fails to teach and/or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, these three references fail to teach and/or suggest that “the supply voltage monitoring circuit outputs an internal reset signal when the level monitored by the supply voltage monitoring circuit becomes lower than a predetermined minimum level”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and the rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (two different rejections).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 depends indirectly from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 11.

New Claims

New claims 18-28 have been added. Claim 18 corresponds to claim 11 in independent form, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claims 19-28 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of new claims 18-28.

Conclusion

Applicants' amendments and remarks have overcome the objection and rejections set forth in the Office Action dated April 13, 2005. Specifically, Applicants' remarks have distinguished claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 from Huard and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants' remarks have also distinguished claim 15 from the combination of Huard and Clark and thus overcome the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants' remarks have also distinguished claim 16 from the combination of Huard and He and thus overcome the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants' remarks have also overcome the objection to claim 11. Applicants' remarks have distinguished new claims 18-28 from the cited prior art. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-16 and 18-28 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-16 and 18-28.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 108066-00092.

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz

Enclosure: Extra Claims Transmittal

TECH/318004.1